

ELECTIONS/RESTRICTIONS

The Examiner has required restriction between product and process claims and has identified two distinct inventions. Invention I (claims 1-8) and Invention II (claims 9-13).

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicant hereby elects Invention I, claims 1-8, for further examination, with traverse.

Claim 9 is a product claim dependent on claim 1, which is a process claim. Claim 9 therefore is a product-by-process claim and should properly be examined with claims 1-8

Furthermore, it is submitted that there would not be a serious burden on the examiner without restriction. The product claims (claims 9-13) are not so numerous, and are similar enough in scope to the process claims, that searching and examining both sets of claims would not impose a serious burden on the examiner. Therefore, restriction in this case is not proper.

Dated February 9, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,
Neena Gandhi, et al.
By her Agent



Edward Yoo (Reg. No. 41,435)